

1963

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

A6945

tionally offending one group or another. Honestly, with the way we conduct ourselves at these international conferences, I can't understand how we Americans could possibly have a friend left in the world.

And yet every night at the bar after the sessions, our European friends gather warmly around us. Such surprisingly forgiving people. Really, it's a privilege to keep on buying them drinks.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Oct. 30, 1963]

## A FIENDISH NEW COMMUNIST POLICY

(By Arthur Hoppe)

WILTON PARK, ENGLAND.—Oh, that Mr. Khrushchey is a sly dog. He's one-upped us again. Remember how Mr. Kennedy magnanimously suggested United States-Soviet cooperation in the moon race? So it would end in a tie? At last we have Mr. Khrushchey's answer: Nyet. The proud Russian people, he says proudly, will settle for nothing less than total defeat.

"We do not want to compete in sending people to the moon," he now says blandly. And as for the Americans \$40 billion effort to get there first: "We wish them," he adds politely, "luck."

There goes peaceful coexistence. We are faced, fellow Americans, with a far more fiendish Communist policy: competitive unresistance.

Oh, it strikes at the one weakness in the American character. For while we are imbued with the will to win, we can't stand licking somebody who isn't trying. Competitive unresistance, let me warn you, will sap our will to resist.

And if there are skeptics, let me merely point out that already our Congressmen are saying we must stop trying so hard to get to the moon. If the Communists aren't racing us, they ask, why should we go? So already, by conceding us victory, Mr. Khrushchey has thrown our whole moon program into grave danger.

This initial smashing success of competitive unresistance is bound to lead the Kremlin on. First, of course, they will give up competing with us for the loyalties of the poor countries. At a stroke, they will knock off Soviet aid to 47 nations from Aardvarkia to Zululand.

You can imagine the reaction of our Congressmen: "And I want to say, gentlemen, that if this here Aardvarkia ain't good enough for the Commies, it ain't good enough for us." And there goes our whole foreign aid program.

Eventually, in self defense, we would be forced into trying to beat the Communists at their own game. Just as we always have. Oh, I can see the press dispatches flowing in now:

Moscow.—Premier Khrushchey today announced the withdrawal of Soviet troops from East Berlin. "So who," he said in a major policy statement, "needs it?"

WASHINGTON.—President Kennedy retaliated tonight by abandoning West Germany and tossing in France. "My only regret," he said with a brave smile, "is that we have but one General de Gaulle to give for our country."

Moscow.—Soviet troops marched home from the Balkans and Cuba today. A White House announcement giving up Mississippi was expected momentarily. Meanwhile, the dismantlement of Russian rockets continued at a feverish pace and . . .

Oh, there's no question about it. This new Kremlin policy of competitive unresistance will cripple our whole foreign policy. For, as you know, we do absolutely nothing in the world today unless it "aids in the fight against communism." And if they won't fight?

Of course, we could do some things for other reasons. Like maybe feeding people because they're hungry. Or reaching for the

moon because we believe the future of our race lies in the stars. But would Congress buy that? Nonsense. It's unrealistic.

So I say we must meet this new Soviet threat head on. We must abolish our moon program, knock off foreign aid and do our utmost, fellow Americans, to make our Nation a second-rate power. But cheer up. I'm certain we can count on Congress.

[From the San Francisco Chronicle, Oct. 31, 1963]

## OUR SCANDALS ARE A REAL SCANDAL

(By Arthur Hoppe)

LONDON.—What a lucky break. Here is this high-level Government sex scandal breaking in Washington. And here I am in England, mother of parliaments, cultural center of the English-speaking world, and home of the high-level Government's sex scandal.

Being an ace newsman, my first thought was, naturally: "An analytical piece." And my second, of course: "Miss Christine Rice-Cristies." Who is, undeniably, a leading expert on the whole subject. With incredible luck I managed to catch Miss Rice-Cristies alone in the salon of her news house. Between appointments with her lawyer and her publisher.

"What can I do for you, Love?" she asked, sinking into her Louis Cinq sofa and crossing one scantily clad knee over the other. "A magazine series? A Sunday supplement article?"

No, I said, I was seeking her expert analysis of this big sex scandal in Washington involving this beautiful German girl and . . . "What did she do?" inquired Miss Rice-Cristies, showing interest. Well, I said, nobody seemed to know, but she was denying it vigorously.

"A shame that," said Miss Rice-Cristies. "A denial always hurts book sales later. And who is the Cabinet Minister involved? War Ministers are best. But I supposed even an Under Secretary would do in a pinch."

Well, I said, we did not exactly have a Cabinet Minister involved. But the name of Mr. Bobby Baker was cropping up. And he used to be secretary to the Senate majority leader.

"Really?" she said, suppressing a yawn. "Pretty small potatoes, if you ask me. But go ahead, love. Tell me the parts about the girls in the pool and the whippings and the nude man in the mask. I am sure you Americans must have come up with something new."

Well, I said, very hangdog, there was not much of that so far. But we had hopes. Mr. Baker's secretary was once named "Miss Peace." And we ace newsmen had dug up incontrovertible evidence proving his chauffeur was arrested last year for speeding. But other than that, I admitted, the scandal seemed mostly over financial deals.

"Oh, simple corruption," said Miss Rice-Cristies with a sniff. "Is not that just like you Yanks? Really, no offense, but you have no talent at all for a proper scandal. Lack of tradition, I suppose. Now when you look back over a thousand years of English history, think of the glorious names that leap from the pages: Lady Hamilton, Nell Gwyn, Lady Castlemaine . . . I say, how is that for a title? 'Me and Nell Gwyn.' Do run along, love. I have to write."

Alas, it is true. And you can not blame the British for looking down their noses at our lack of cultural traditions. But we keep trying. And as a patriotic American I can only hope this current Washington scandal will blossom passionately. Can we not link Mr. L. B. What's-his-name with Madame Nhu? Or something?

For while I love the British dearly, at the moment they are insufferable. Oh, I do not mind a whit their superiority in manners, dress, and language. But if there is one thing I cannot stand, it is their sexier-than-thou attitude.

## Soviet Inhumanity to Man

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

## HON. DONALD C. BRUCE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 7, 1963

Mr. BRUCE. Mr. Speaker, every American citizen who today breathes the air of freedom is truly indebted to Haym Salomon, whose great financial assistance to the cause of the American Revolution left his family practically penniless at his death in 1785.

Were he alive today, Salomon would undoubtedly be in the forefront demanding that the persecution of his Jewish coreligionists in the U.S.S.R., along with the oppression of the other captive states, be publicized and acted upon in the United Nations. He would also have found it ironic that the nation which he helped to establish would later condone by silence and inaction a program of persecution similar to the one he fought and detested.

The following two items graphically illustrate just one aspect of Soviet oppression against the Jewish people. The letter to the editor of the Chicago (Ill.) Sentinel and the news item from the Urbana (Ill.) Jewish Chronicle, should be thoroughly digested by all those who favor the sale of wheat to Russia, while at the same time remaining strangely silent concerning the persecution of the Jewish, and other captive, peoples.

To help publicize this program of Soviet inhumanity to man, I include the following items in the RECORD:

WHY PLACE BREAD IN THE MOUTHS OF THOSE WHO WON'T GIVE US MATZO?

DEAR EDITOR: For the past few weeks the American press has made headlines over the probable sale of wheat to the Communists. All seem to forget the Russian drive to bury us. The most successful plan of burying the Jews spiritually, culturally, and ethnically in Russia may give further comfort to anti-Semites here and abroad.

Should we as Jews in the United States sit back and condone the placing of bread in the mouths of Communists who condemn Jews to jail sentences for buying a piece of matzo? Buying matzo or a Jewish religious book earns the buyer a sentence of 10 years; but will Khrushchey and his fellow party members get a sentence to Siberia for buying wheat from American speculators? Absolutely not.

If there is one thing that oppressors hate, it is that of being constantly exposed. Put the pressure on. Write the Agriculture Department in Washington. Tell the administration what you think. This is not a case of beating a dead horse. The Communists will give ground only if you show sufficient opposition. The Jew who is a libertarian for everybody else surely owes it to himself in terms of self-respect to rise up in wrath.

Sincerely yours,

MEYER WIDREWITZ.

## MOSCOW COURT UPHOLDS CONVICTION OF JEWS FOR HOME-BAKED MATZO

LONDON (WNS).—Three Russian Jews who were sentenced last July to prison terms ranging from 6 months to 1 year for selling home-baked matzo had their appeal turned down by the appeals court in Moscow, ac-

A6946

## CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — APPENDIX

November 7

cording to reports reaching here from the Soviet Union.

The convicted Jews were Golko Bogomolny, a Jewish ritual butcher, who received a 1-year penalty, 52-year-old Klavdia Blykman, and 59-year-old Mrs. Malka Brlo, who each got 8 months. The Soviet Union had forbidden bakeries to bake matzoth for Passover, but there were semi-official intimations that Jews could bake in their homes. In fact, the chief rabbi of Moscow so stated in one of his sermons in which he said Jews would not remain without matzoth since they could bake their own. It was believed among Moscow's Jews that the chief rabbi would not have made that statement unless it were previously cleared with authoritative sources. The three convicted Jews denied they were selling the matzoth, claiming they baked the matzoth for distribution among Jewish neighbors. During their trial, their lawyer called the court's attention to the fact that Christian religious groups in the Soviet Union were treated less harshly in their religious observances.

The three Jews, it was reported, are planning to carry their appeal to the Supreme Court of the Russian Federated Republic.

## Foreign Policy Assailed

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. KATHARINE ST. GEORGE

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 7, 1963

Mrs. ST. GEORGE. Mr. Speaker, the following letter appeared in the New York Times and is dated September 24, 1963.

The letter is written by former Congressman Hamilton Fish, who served on the Foreign Affairs Committee during his term of office.

The letter is timely and shows Mr. Fish's continued interest in the foreign policy of our country:

NEW YORK, N.Y.  
September 24, 1963.

## FOREIGN POLICY ASSAILED

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NEW YORK TIMES:

President Kennedy admits the responsibility for the tragic fiasco at the Bay of Pigs, but does he admit his responsibility for destroying the Monroe Doctrine and permitting thousands of Russian soldiers, contrary to its traditional principles, to organize Cuba into a fortress, build submarine bases and headquarters for Communist propaganda in South and Central America?

Does he admit the responsibility for the shambles in South Vietnam, where gangsters in the pay of the CIA are waging a religious war and undermining the will in the people to fight communism?

Senator Robert Taft issued a public statement just before he died warning the United States against sending American soldiers into Southeast Asia, where we would be vastly outnumbered by Communist guerrillas who could live on a handful of rice in the jungles but were grave fighters and could trigger a rifle.

The time has come for an agonizing reappraisal of our spending over \$1 million a day, 10,000 miles away in South Vietnam, while 12,000 Russian soldiers help build communism into a powerful military and propaganda weapon at our very doorstep.

Why does not the administration demand that all Russian soldiers and technicians be withdrawn from Cuba by the end of this year,

and in case of refusal by the Soviet Government openly arm and equip Cubans in Florida and in Central American countries and organize a powerful force for the liberation of Cuba from the cancer of communism?

President Kennedy is a young man of many words and more alibis. The American people are watching and waiting, and their patience is nearly exhausted.

HAMILTON FISH.

(NOTE.—The writer of the above was a Republican Member of Congress from 1920 to 1945.)

## Christmas

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ADAM C. POWELL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 7, 1963

Mr. POWELL. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks in the Record, I include the following statement by the Association of Artists for Freedom:

## CHRISTMAS

We believe in Christmas, because it is the birthday of the Prince of Peace and brotherhood; the birthday of the Christ who chased the moneychangers from the temple; who said, "Love thy neighbor as thyself," who said, "Suffer the little children to come unto me, for such is the Kingdom of Heaven." This is the Christ we will celebrate; the great Jewish carpenter-philosopher who was born in a manger in Bethlehem.

Thousands of atrocities committed against humanity and the Negro people from slavery to the present time, have gone unpunished. And now we are mocking the Prince of Peace; throwing bombs in the Holy Place of God; blasting the brains of His children against the high walls of His tabernacle in Birmingham; turning His day of days into a sabbath ritual of blood and destruction. We are guilty. Not only those who planted the bomb, but those who condone injustice and segregation and thereby give it sanction; those who profit from it and those who do not work to eradicate it. We are all guilty. And who among us can participate in life as usual, in business as usual, or even Christmas as usual?

Let us celebrate Christmas this year in a way that will bear witness to the life and the love of Jesus. Let us recreate from His life that image including all the Adams and Eves and their countless generations. Let us repent this most recent of our crimes against humanity and God; the murder of or tender six of Birmingham, with the fervent determination that it will never be 60, or 600, 6,000, or another 6 million.

This year we will give our children the profoundest gift of all: the gift of truth, which is the gift of love. And we will have the duty to tell them that Santa will not come this year because he is in mourning for the children of Birmingham, who will get no gifts this year or the next year or the next. And for the children too young to understand we will make gifts and toys with our hands from boxes and cans and string and last year's toys and paste and paint and wood and love.

To the sellers of trees and trains and pins and pianos, we urge you to understand and to pledge with us, that this Christmas shall come from our hearts and minds, not from our pocketbooks. To the ones who must give something, notwithstanding, we urge you to give to the organizations and institutions working to build and strengthen the moral and religious fiber of our Nation.

It is in this spirit that we ask all Americans of all colors, creeds, and religions, to join us in this determination to put Christ back into Christmas and His great life back into moral and religious perspective.

JAMES BALDWIN,  
OSSIE DAVIS,  
RUBY DEE,  
ODETTA GORDAN,  
JOHN O. KILLENS,  
LOUIS LOMAX,

Association of Artists for Freedom.

## Changes in Thinking

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, November 7, 1963

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the view of the American public is often quite distinct from the mental atmosphere existing in Washington, and is clearly evident by adverse public reaction to the cleverly glamorized domestic and foreign policy schemes of the administration.

The Blue Island Sun-Standard, an independent community newspaper serving the south suburban area of Cook County, Ill., in a timely and scholarly editorial sums up the public appraisal of the general Washington legislative scene. I feel it is especially appropriate, dramatizing as it does public approval of congressional independence of the executive branch. I insert the editorial into the Record at this point:

## CHANGES IN THINKING

The tortuous progress that the administration's tax reduction bill has been making toward eventual enactment provides a significant and interesting example of changes in thinking that have been taking place in this country, and in Congress.

The tax bill is at the very heart of Mr. Kennedy's economic program. It is, he argues again and again, the essential force needed to stimulate economic growth, to provide more goods and services, to create more jobs, to increase the general standard of living, and to strengthen the Nation all along the line.

The President and his advisers would have had good reason to believe that a tax reduction bill would make its way through Congress with much less difficulty than in the present case. In the past, tax reduction has offered about as sure-fire an appeal as anything could. Bills have gone through with next to no debate. Here is the most tangible of all ways, Congress has felt, to make the folks back home happy.

It is very different now—not because tax reduction isn't wanted. It is. But there is grave concern over how best to achieve it without creating new and formidable dangers.

It is argued, for instance, that balanced budgets are a shibboleth, and that deficits can be almost a way of fiscal life for a nation without undermining its economic strength and stability. In other words, in effect, this theory holds that a nation is not comparable to a business or family. It is something to which the usual rules do not apply. But this theory has not been tested, and a great many people believe that the